

REMARKS

Claims 7, 8 and 10-17 were pending in the above-identified application. By means of the present amendment, claim 8 has been canceled. Claim 16 has been canceled and its limitations incorporated into independent claims 7 and 17. Claims 7, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 17 have been amended to better point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

In the Advisory Action, the rejection of claims 7, 8, 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gozdz et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,840,087) in view of *Kumeuchi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,156,080) was maintained. The rejection stated, in relevant part:

[...] it is noted that the instant specification discloses that the electrolyte layers contain salt before and during the lamination process. However, the instant claims do not recite this.

(See the Advisory Action of September 6, 2006, page 2)

Although Applicants disagree with the rejection, it is submitted that independent claims 7 and 17 now feature the limitation that the electrolyte contain salt, a limitation previously included in now canceled claim 16.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

October 11, 2006

/David R. Metzger/ (Reg. No. 32,919)

David R. Metzger

P. O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

Customer No. 26263